

Attorney Docket No.: 2001P17045US01

REMARKS:

In the Office Action mailed June 10, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 33-34, 36, 39-60, and objected to claims 35, and 37-38. For the reasons provided below, Applicants request that all pending claims be allowed.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 33-34, 39-43, 45-46, 49-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0010892 to Clark ("*Clark*").

Applicants assert that *Clark* does not disclose the OLED light source claimed in independent claim 33. More specifically, Applicants assert that *Clark* does not disclose that "said first electrode and said second electrode are aligned in the same direction" as recited in claim 33. Applicant's invention as defined by claim 33 specify that the first electrode and the second electrode are aligned in the same direction, that is, the first electrode and the second electrode are not perpendicular to each other. In contrast, Fig. 6 of *Clark* show that the "transparent anode electrodes 605" are aligned perpendicularly to the "cathode electrodes 635, 640, and 645"; nowhere in *Clark* is it shown or described that the "transparent anode electrodes 605" and the "cathode electrodes 635, 640, and 645" are aligned in the same direction (e.g., parallel) to each other.

Support for the element that "said first electrode and said second electrode are aligned in the same direction" is provided at, for example, FIG. 1 of Applicant's application which shows that the "transparent conductor 106" is aligned in the same direction as the "cathode structure 112". In addition, lines 22-26 on page 4 of Applicant's specification indicate that the "cathode structure 112" and the "transparent conductor 106" (e.g., anode structure) can be aligned in the same direction.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 33. Claims 34, 36, and 39-53 depend from claim 33. Accordingly, they are patentable over *Clark* at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 33.

Independent claim 54 includes the limitation that "said first electrode and said second electrode are aligned in the same direction"; thus, for reasons similar to those provided earlier with respect to claim 33, the Applicants assert that claim 54 is patentable over *Clark*. Claims 55-58 depend from claim 54. Accordingly, they are patentable over *Clark* at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 54.

Attorney Docket No.: 2001P17045US01

Independent claim 59 includes the limitation that "said first electrode and said second electrode are aligned in the same direction"; thus, for reasons similar to those provided earlier with respect to claim 33, the Applicants assert that claim 59 is patentable over *Clark*. Claims 60 depends from claim 59. Accordingly, it is patentable over *Clark* at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 59.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 36, 44, and 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Clark*.

Claims 36, 44, and 47-48 depend from claim 33. For the reasons provided earlier with respect to claim 33, *Clark* does not disclose or suggest that "said first electrode and said second electrode are aligned in the same direction" as recited in claim 33. Accordingly, these claims are patentable over *Clark* at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 33. In rejecting these claims, the Examiner relies on the knowledge of those skilled in the art; however, if the Examiner is going to rely on this knowledge, then Applicants request that the Examiner provide evidence that the information is known to those skilled in the art as is required. *See, for example, In re Sang-Su Lee*, 277 F.3d at 1344.

Attorney Docket No.: 2001P17045US01

CONCLUSION:

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179 of Siemens Corporation.

PLEASE MAIL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Siemens Corporation
Customer No. 28524
Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Administrator
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas George

Thomas George, Reg. No. 45,740
Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)
Telephone: 650-694-5191
Date: Nov. 10, 2005